



Hazlett, W. (2017) Editorial. *Reformation and Renaissance Review*, 19(3), pp. 169-170. (doi:[10.1080/14622459.2017.1392415](https://doi.org/10.1080/14622459.2017.1392415))

This is the author's final accepted version.

There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/152683/>

Deposited on: 29 November 2017

Enlighten – Research publications by members of the University of Glasgow
<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk>

News on the award of the 2016 *Douglas Murray Prize* will be announced soon, initially on the websites of this journal and of Refo500 or RefoRC. Furthermore, we are glad to welcome the accession to RRR's Editorial Board of Prof. Annie Noblesse-Rocher of Strasbourg and Paris, whose work on internal medieval continuities in the first-generation Reformation is well known. On the Board she will replace in various respects the late David Steinmetz, while also bringing something different.

RRR's chief contribution to the current flurry of writings great and small on the Reformation-1517 jubilee is a long article by the Berlin church historian, Dorothea Wendebourg, on Judaism and the Jews in Luther's theology. This, of course, has little to do with the particular issues in 1517 or with 1517 as a major historical watershed. But as Professor Wendebourg promptly points out, the somewhat unhinged reduction of the Reformation quincentenary (at large) to yet another Martin Luther festival along with a further constriction of this (within Germany) to the hot potato of 'Luther and the Jews' has generated a controversial atmosphere shrouding many Reformation commemoration discussions in the country. There has been a lot of focus on the – by any standards – sordid and despicable treatment of Judaism and Jews in Luther's late writings. Those tracts contrasted with the tentative outreach and expressions of vague fellowship evident in his early writing on the subject. Since the late-seventeenth century, the early approach was traditionally highlighted (except for the now demonstrable use of the late Luther's anti-Jewish polemic in the Nazi era). Wendebourg observes that the contemporary preoccupation in Germany has gone so far as to make the late Luther's Jewish hysterics a sort *articulus stantis vel cadentis* of not only Luther, but also the complete Lutheran theology along with the entire German Reformation. However, rather than assessing Luther's staggering paroxysm in terms of the usual moral, cultural, political and historical parameters which normally determine modern studies of antisemitism, this article – with striking sobriety and formidable mastery of original Luther sources – aims to unveil certain flaws in Luther's theology causing him to be derailed from his own better theology. This was not in opposing Judaism (no crime in that), but in the abusive, dehumanizing and persecuting tones accompanying it, perversely playing at God. Wendebourg's analysis of the inner roots of the problem is partly systematic and partly hermeneutical-exegetical. She finds the key to the matter not so much in Luther's doctrine of justification as in his appeal to a theocratic concept of God-in-society linked with Christology. The conclusion is that Luther had relapsed into an obsolete religious concept and fell foul of an untypically (for him) uncritical Biblicism in appealing to rational, evidence-based, historical proofs of Jewish, self-damning

intransigence. However, that Luther in this instance ironically confused the Two Kingdoms, the Two Testaments as well as faith and reason does not have to imply that such a misapplication completely explodes the foundations of his overall theology or turns it all into a poison chalice.

Federico Zuliani's instructive article is refreshing in so far as it studies neither a big name nor a big topic, rather the routine study, preaching and teaching of a not-widely-known, but relatively influential, Italian Protestant pastor in the late-sixteenth century. This was Scipio Lentulo, based in Chiavenna at the intersection of Swiss and Italian territories. While Lentulo did publish various writings, some notable, the authenticity of the picture of him depicted here is enhanced by Zuliani's unearthing of archival sources. These are Lentulo's own annotated Bible, and a MS text of questions and answers for use in discussions with the literate members of his congregation immersed in Bible knowledge. Interest in Lentulo is at various levels: he was a religious refugee and an example of the transition from an Italian Catholic, monastic and scholastic background to an autodidactic Reformed stance including ministry. Further, the study demonstrates the partiality for Calvin among Italian pro-Reformation communities in this era; it discloses the intense study of the Bible in such circles; and it reveals how Lentulo's developing Hebrew studies which, by chance, led him and his community in Chiavenna away from a naively literalist interpretation of the Bible to, for example, a humanist critical awareness that Moses could hardly have been the author of the Pentateuch.

The well-crafted and provocative study by Liam Temple is a fascinating example of a degree of demythologizing or historical deconstruction of what was an iconic, venerated figure in English Catholic milieus, the exiled Benedictine mystic, Augustine Baker, who was active mostly in the first half of the seventeenth century. While Baker devotees had long focussed on a somewhat eulogizing account of his life and thought by a seventeenth-century disciple, the modern publication (based on surviving MSS) of various other devotional writings by Baker has also revived religious interest in him. However, despite the plausible modern Baker editions, Temple questions the saintliness of the received Baker after examining source manuscripts or transcripts of the Benedictine's prolific works. It was always agreed that controversy and disruption did surround Baker in his lifetime. His later and modern followers attributed this solely to jealousy of his spiritual popularity as a guest confessor for exiled English nuns in a convent in France. Temple argues that this explanation was a successful and enduring legend devised to conceal other problems – nothing shady, rather: issues like a cavalier attitude to ecclesiastical or monastic order, authority and

jurisdiction on the one hand, and on the other: the exaltation of mystical experience to the extent that Catholic orthodoxy was put at risk. Therefore the jealousy hypothesis was a trivialization; it obscured a figure of disorder somewhat undermining the mediatorial role of the Church's priesthood and the divine source of her canonical theological tradition, as well as highlighting individual quest as the path to salvation for cloistered elites. Temple just alludes to transconfessional analogies of mysticism's potential kinship with heterodoxy, but his study also accidentally shows that contentiousness and divisiveness was not exclusive to Protestant exilic communities in the Reformation era